

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-19, 32, 51, 54-56, 58, 60-64 and 66-99 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 9-16, 18, 19, 32, 51, 54, 56, 58, 60-62 and 64 are amended. Claims 2, 5-8, 20-31, 33-50, 52, 53, 57, 59 and 65 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein. New claims 66-99 are added.

In paragraph 1 on page 2, the Office Action alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The title of the invention is amended to add descriptive content. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended title is sufficiently descriptive and therefore request that the amended title be accepted.

In paragraphs 2-5 on page 2, the Office Action objects to claims 14, 15, 51 and 57-59. Claims 14, 15, 51 and 58 are amended to address the objections specified in the Office Action. Claims 57 and 59 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein. Regarding differentiation of claims, Applicants note that there is a difference between repellency to solution of the optical material or a precursor of the optical material and repellency to the optical material in liquid or a liquid precursor of the optical material. It is respectfully submitted that amended claims 14, 15, 51 and 58 overcome the objections stated in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the claims specified in paragraphs 2-5 on page 2 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In section 7 on page 3, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 50, 51 and 56-65 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 51, 56, 58, 60-62 and 64 are amended to address this rejection. Claims 50, 57, 59 and 65 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein. Claim 63 depends from amended claim 62. It is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1, 51, 56, 58, 60-62 and 64 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that

the rejection of claims 1, 50, 51 and 56-65 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In section 9 on pages 4-6, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 7, 50, 51, 57-59, 61, 62, 64 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document No. 06-281917 to Yuichi in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,863,332 to Leupp et al. (hereinafter "Leupp"). In section 10 on page 6, the Office Action rejects claims 56 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuichi in view of Leupp, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,781,438 to Noguchi. In section 11 on pages 7-8, the Office Action rejects claims 5, 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuichi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,138 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter "Yamazaki"). In section 12 on pages 8-9, the Office Action rejects claims 2, 3 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document No. 59-75205 to Ogata in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,552,192 to Kashiwazaki et al. (hereinafter "Kashiwazaki"). In section 13 on page 9, the Office Action rejects claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata in view of Kashiwazaki, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,400,157 to Won. In section 14 on page 10, the Office Action rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata in view of Kashiwazaki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,831,701 to Matsuyama et al. (hereinafter "Matsuyama"). In section 15 on pages 10-11, the Office Action rejects claims 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata in view of Kashiwazaki and further in view of Noguchi. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 5-8, 50, 53, 57, 59 and 65 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein.

Regarding the rejections relying on Yuichi, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuichi discloses a display device comprising an optical material arranged at a predetermined position by features. Yuichi does not disclose, teach or suggest that the features are projections (a

difference in height), or that the wiring (bus lines, scanning lines, signal lines and supply lines) form the features. All of the pending claims include one or more of the foregoing according to various combinations. None of the other applied references overcome these deficiencies in Yuichi.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejections specified in paragraphs 9-15 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

New claims 66-99 are allowable for reasons similar to the reasons stated above in connection with the rejected claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 9-19, 32, 51, 54-56, 58, 60-64 and 66-69 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/sqb

Date: December 10, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--